

Remarks

Claims 4, 7-12, 14-17, and 19-20 were submitted for examination. Claims 4, 7-12, 14-17, and 19-20 stand rejected. Claims 14-17, 19, and 20 have been canceled. New claims 21 and 22 have been added.

Claims 4, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,278,553, in view of Garvis, U.S. Pat. No. 5,647,011.

Claims 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett in view of Garvis as applied to Claim 9, and in further view of McConnell et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,710,555.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett in view of Garvis as applied to Claim 4, and further in view of Wilhelm.

Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,278,553, in view of Garvis, U.S. Pat. No. 5,647,011.

The Office Action asserts that it was well known to incorporate headphones in vehicles, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the headphone sound system of Garvis, whereby the headphones broadcast the sound associated with emergency vehicles from a microphone, in the vehicle system of Cornett for the purpose of supplying the driver with sounds of warning signals through earphones. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Headphone sound systems such as the sound system of Garvis are typically portable systems and not typically integrated with vehicles. Such portable devices include cell phones, personal digital assistants, laptop computers, televisions, game consoles, VCR's etc. (See Applicant's Specification, page 2, lines 5-9). The Office has the burden under section 103 to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant requests the Office to cite a reference in support of its position per MPEP 2144.03.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Garvis and Cornett, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 4. The rejection of Claim 4 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 7-12 depend from allowable Claim 4 and are allowable for at least this reason.

New Claims 21 and 22

Support for new Claim 21 can be found in the Applicant's Specification at least at page 8, line 20 through page 9, line 5.

Support for new Claim 22 can be found in the Applicant's Specification at least at page 9 line 22 through page 9, line 1.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: 9-13-04

Rita M. Wisor

Rita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number: (512) 732-3923

Correspondence Address: Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

9/13/04

Date of Deposit

Gayle Bekish

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Gayle 9/13/04

Signature

Date